

1 recites, for example, "a heater." The drawings show a heater 5 and a heater 6. Claim 1 recites "a component adjacent to the heater." Figure 1 shows, for example, a component next to heater 5 in the form of the generally circular structure to which flaps 7, 7' attach. Either one of the heaters could also be a component adjacent to the other heater.

The Office Action asks whether claim 1 would cover a hypothetical structure like the structure disclosed in claim 1 but without supplemental heater 6. Claim 1 recites "a heater." The structure posited by the examiner would include a heater, namely, heater 5. Therefore, a structure like the one disclosed in claim 1 but without heater 6 would infringe claim 1. It is also respectfully submitted that a structure like the one of claim 1 but with three heaters, four heaters, or any greater number of heaters would also infringe claim 1. Claim language generally covers structures beyond those that are illustrated in the drawings. There is no requirement that every physical structure that might infringe a claim be illustrated in drawings; in fact, in most cases, it would be impossible to do so. If the examiner is asserting that the drawing must show every device that might infringe a given claim, it is respectfully requested that the legal authority for this requirement be identified.

The claims are not written in a limiting manner; for example, the claims do not specifically preclude the presence of certain elements. If a claim required the absence of an element, Applicant would agree that a device without the element should be shown in the drawings. For example, if Applicant had claimed "The air conditioning system of claim 1 wherein said heater comprises exactly one (or no more than one) heater in the housing..." a drawing showing exactly one heater would be needed.

However, no such claim is present in this application. Claim 1 recites a heater. The drawings show a heater as specified in claim 1 and satisfy the requirements of 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a).

Whether or not the examiner withdraws the drawing requirement, it is respectfully submitted that this traversal of the requirement, supported by argument, is fully responsive to the requirement. If the requirement for additional or amended drawings is not withdrawn, it is respectfully requested that the examiner identify the legal authority that defines "inherently claimed" and that requires such inherently claimed features to be shown in the drawings so that the basis for this requirement can be better understood.

Regarding the second issue raised in the Notice, a dividing element that contacts and overlaps at least one dividing wall is illustrated in Figure 1. Figure 1 illustrates dividing walls 8 and dividing elements 9 and 16. Dividing element 16 includes a linear portion that is received between the two arms of the U-shaped end of dividing wall 8. Elements 8 and 9 are in contact, and the arms of the U-shaped end of dividing wall 8 overlap the end of dividing element 16. Similar overlaps can be seen on the structures between heaters 5 and 6 and below heat 5 in Figure 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted that at least Figure 1 provides support for the language added to claim 1 and the language of new claim 11.

Each issue in the Notice mailed June 3, 2010, has been addressed. Wherefore, the allowance of all claims or the issuance of a further Office Action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

*Deposit Account Authorization*

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 50-3828 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Martin R. Geissler  
Registration No. 51011

PO BOX 1364  
Fairfax, VA 22038-1364  
1.703.621.7140

Date: June 21, 2010